

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

STATUS OF CLAIMS

In response to the Office Action dated April 3, 2007, claims 16, 24, 26, 28 and 30 have been amended, and claims 23, 25, 29 and 39-41 have been canceled. Claims 16-22, 24, 26-28 and 30-38 are now pending in this application. No new matter has been added.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

I. Claims 16-41 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshimura et al. (USPN 5,596,419) in view of Takahashi et al. (USPN 5,805,933).

The rejections of claims 25, 26, 29 and 30-38 are respectfully traversed.

II. The Examiner refers to column 4, lines 57+ of Yoshimura et al. as disclosing the features of claim 25 and to column 5, lines 5-27 of Yoshimura et al. as disclosing the features of claim 26.

Column 4, line 57 to column 5, line 4 of Yoshimura et al. describes:

The output of the mixer 32 is written into the field memory 36 every time the index signal is supplied to the control circuit 42. In other words, *for every image plane representing one program, one field portion of the video signal indicative of the representative image plane is written into the memory 36.* The field memory 36 and the control circuit 42 together form a first extracting means. The one field portion of the video signal which is written into the memory 36 is supplied to the Y/C separation circuit 38 to be divided into the Y signal and the C signal. The demodulating and line-sequential circuit 40 first demodulates the C signal separated by the Y/C separation circuit 38 to form thereby two color-difference signals R-Y and B-Y.

The circuit 40 then alternately produces the color-difference signals R-Y and B-Y for every H (horizontal scanning) period.

However, claim 25 requires:

said still image producing portion cuts out the still image at a start of the video recording, after a prescribed time from the start of the video recording or every time a prescribed period of time is elapsed.

That is, after a still image is cut out at a start of video recording, another is cut out after a prescribed time from the start of the video recording or every time a prescribed period of time is elapsed. Such time dependency is not disclosed or suggested in Yoshimura et al., which discloses only that *for every image plane representing one program, one field portion of the video signal indicative of the representative image plane is written into the memory*. That is, only when an image plane represents another “program” will one field portion of the video signal indicative of the image plane be written into the memory. This is not dependent upon a prescribed time. This feature is also not disclosed in Takahashi. Consequently, claim 25 is patentable over Yoshimura and Takahashi.

To expedite prosecution, independent claim 16 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 23 and 25, now canceled, and claim 24 has been amended to depend from amended independent claim 16.

Thus, amended independent claim 16 now recites, *inter alia*:

...and

a still image producing portion producing a still image by cutting out the still image to be recorded in the still image recording portion from the video recorded by said video recording portion, wherein

said still image producing portion cuts out a still image one of (i) at a start of the video recording, (ii) after a prescribed time from the start of the video recording and (iii) every time a prescribed period of time is elapsed.

Column 5, lines 5-27 of Yoshimura et al. describes:

The frequency modulation circuit 44 frequency-modulates the luminance (Y) signal separated by the Y/C separation circuit 38. The other frequency modulation circuit 46 frequency-modulates a line-sequential color-difference signals produced from the demodulating and line-sequential circuit 40. In this instance, the modulated carrier frequency of the color-difference signals is arranged to be lower than that of the luminance signal.

Further, the modulated carrier frequencies of the color-difference signals R-Y and B-Y are arranged to differ by 0.1 MHz from each other for a discrimination between these color-difference signals.

The ID processing circuit 48 receives a signal for look-up (including an index signal and a time code signal indicative of the beginning and the end of a corresponding program) from the control circuit 42. The ID processing circuit 48 and the control circuit 42 together form a second extracting means. The ID processing circuit 48 converts the look-up signal into a DPSK signal. The mixer 50 produces the outputs of the frequency modulation circuits 44 and 46 and that of the ID processing circuit 48 by frequency-multiplexing them. The signal output of the mixer 50 has a spectral frequency distribution as shown in FIG. 4(b). The output of the mixer 50 is applied to the recording head 54 via the recording amplifier 52. The head 54 then records it on a still video disc which is not shown.

However, claim 26 requires:

said still image producing portion cuts out and records the still image by detecting a switching of a sound multiplex mode.

Clearly, column 5, lines 5-27 of Yoshimura et al. has no description regarding cutting out and recording the still image by *detecting a switching of a sound multiplex mode*. This feature is also not disclosed in Takahashi. Consequently, claim 26 is patentable over Yoshimura and Takahashi.

To expedite prosecution, claim 26 has been amended to be in independent form including all the limitations of base claim 16 and intervening claim 23.

In view of the above, claims 16-22, 24, 26 and 27, as amended, are patentable over Yoshimura and Takahashi, and their allowance is respectfully solicited.

III. Claim 29 requires, *inter alia*:

a still image producing portion producing the still image by cutting out the still image from the video...

The Examiner refers to column 8, lines 18+ of Sakaegi et al. as disclosing this feature. However, while Sakaegi et al. (USPN 5,500,743) was used to reject claims 16-41 in the previous Office Action, the Examiner has clearly not included it in the current rejection of claims 16-41.

As noted in the previous response, Sakaegi et al. discloses an image reproduction apparatus reproducing a still image that has been recorded as a video signal (though Sakaegi et al. discloses recording of a still image using a video signal, it does not disclose recording of a video). In the system disclosed in Sakaegi et al., a user provides the system, through remote control, with inputs as to still image processing and displaying. While Sakaegi et al. describes that a control signal is received from an apparatus external to the system, there is no description that the reception of a control signal and the transmission/reception of a still image are carried out with the same communication port.

In response to Applicants' arguments in the previous response, the Examiner purposely replaced Sakaegi et al. with Takahashi to reject claims 16-41 in the present Office Action.

Neither Yoshimura et al. nor Takahashi disclose the features recited in claim 29. Consequently, claim 29 is patentable over Yoshimura et al. and Takahashi.

Claim 30 requires, *inter alia*:

an instruction issuing portion issuing an instruction for cutting out
the still image through said digital network interface...

The Examiner refers to column 8, line 65 through column 9, line 8 of Sakaegi et al. as disclosing this feature. However, as noted above, in response to Applicants' arguments in the previous response, the Examiner purposely replaced Sakaegi et al. with Takahashi to reject claims 16-41. Neither Yoshimura et al. nor Takahashi disclose the features recited in claim 30. Consequently, claim 30, as well as claims 31-35, 37 and 38 depending directly or indirectly from claim 30, are patentable over Yoshimura et al. and Takahashi.

To expedite prosecution, independent claim 28 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 29 (now canceled), but without "in accordance with an instruction of a user", and claim 30 has been amended to be in independent form, including all the limitations of base claim 28. Consequently, claims 28 and 30-36, as amended, are patentable over Yoshimura et al. and Takahashi, and their allowance is respectfully solicited.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is urged that the application, as now amended, is in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Edward J. Wise Reg. No. 34,523 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to

conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: July 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata

Registration No.: 39,491

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant